extending the school day and school year

the education achievement authority of michigan

2012 - 2013

"We have a choice. We can simply maintain and defend what we have … or create what we need."

~ Gary Marx~

Extending the School Day and Year for the Education Achievement Authority of Michigan

The Recommendation

The Education Achievement Authority of Michigan, by virtue of research, student needs, and stakeholder's request, recommend that the EAA adopt and commence its new system of schools with a 220 day calendar for teachers and a 210 day calendar for students. All employees of the EAA with the exception of classroom teachers and instructional assistants, shall be required to work a 12 month calendar commensurate to that followed by business and industry.

Rationale

In 1983, President Ronald Reagan's National Commission on Excellence in Education, led by Secretary T.H. Bell, issued a damning report regarding the status of public schooling in the United States. The opening words of this report, entitled *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform,* are just as true today as they were when the original report was issued.

> 'the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people" and the statement, "If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war.'

For this generation of students to remain competitive with their international peers as adults, they need to start spending more time in school. President Barack Obama proposed that American school children extend their time in class, either by lengthening the school day, or spending less time on summer vacation.

> 'We can no longer afford an academic calendar designed when America was a nation of farmers who needed their children at home plowing the land at the end of each day,' Obama said. He continued to say 'That calendar may have once made sense, but today, it puts us at a competitive disadvantage. Our children spend over a month less in school than children in South Korea. That is no way to prepare them for a 21st century economy.'

Even in 1983, *A Nation at Risk* called for an end to the traditional 6.5 hour, 180 day school year. The report recommended increasing the number of hours in the school day to seven and increasing the number of school days in the year to between 200 and 220. In the 28 years since the report was issued, however, its recommendation has not been widely adopted in U.S. public schools, in large part because of the high cost associated with extending time. (Chalkboard Project 2008; Aronson et al., 1999)

American children spend the least amount time in the classroom when compared to other countries. Currently, the average school year length in the United States is 180 days. Advocates are pushing further toward a 200-day school year, which would align with Hong Kong, and the Netherlands, and leave us a close second with South Korea and Japan, who leads with a 243-day school year as shown in Table I below.

Table I: A Comparison of Annual Days in School with Performance on the Programme *for International Student Assessment*

Country	Days in School Year	PISA Reading Composite	PISA Math Composite	PISA Science Composite
Finland	190	536	541	554
Hong Kong	200	533	555	549
Japan	243	520	529	539
South Korea	220	539	546	538
New Zealand	190	521	519	532
The Netherlands	200	508	526	522
United Kingdom	197	494	490	503
Hungary	192	494	490	503
United States	180	500	487	502
France	185	496	497	499
Luxembourg	216	472	489	484
Israel	216	474	447	N/A

Currently in the U.S., for those states which set a minimum number of days for school, the average number of school days is 179 with the highest in Kansas at 186 days and the lowest, North Dakota, at 173 days. Eight states, including Michigan, do not set minimum standards in days, rather they set a minimum number of hours which fall well below the average across states. If the minimum number of instructional hours required by Michigan (i.e. 1,098 hours) were converted to days, Michigan would be among the lowest minimum number of days at 170.

A review of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores provided in Table II shows that the top ten states on the NAEP have an average school year length of 178 days. The nine states which do not set a minimum number of days, rather a minimum of hours show a mean lower performance of 40 Scale Score points on the Reading, Grade Four, 26.1 Scale Score points on Reading, Grade Eight, 6.2 Scale Score points on Math, Grade Four, and

32.5 Scale Score points on Math Grade Eight when compared to the top performing state in each category.

Table II: A Comparison of Annual Days in School with Performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress

State	Days In School Year	NAEP Grade 4 Reading	NAEP Grade 8 Reading	NAEP Grade 4 Math	NAEP Grade 8 Math
Alabama	175	179	234	207	246
Alaska	180	183	231	218	268
Arizona	180	193	241	212	266
Arkansas	178	200	241	216	267
California	180	202	259	220	N/A
Colorado		183	228	202	256
Connecticut	180	208	243	214	251
D.C.	180	205	244	217	258
Delaware		199	236	220	269
Florida	180	206	262	225	266
Georgia	180	178	209	218	247
Hawaii	180	203	241	239	286
Idaho		186	218	213	261
Illinois	176	198	234	207	251
Indiana	180	203	255	229	273
Iowa	180	194	248	221	263
Kansas	186	186	236	217	265
Kentucky	175	205	253	223	273
Louisiana	177	192	243	221	263
Maine	175	207	253	234	284
Maryland	180	187	237	208	271
Massachusetts	180	134	249	255	300
Michigan		194	236	200	253
Minnesota		204	259	233	287
Mississippi	180	210	254	223	264
Missouri	174	229	267	246	287
Montana	180	198	246	235	285
Nebraska		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nevada	180	202	246	225	269
New Hampshire	180	N/A	N/A	237	281
New Jersey	180	221	244	231	272
New Mexico		207	246	236	277
New York	180	200	247	207	249
North Carolina	180	204	246	220	253
North Dakota	173	203	253	225	278
Ohio	182	192	251	219	265
Oklahoma	180	212	249	228	269
Oregon		177	250	214	266

Pennsylvania	180	206	245	218	272
Puerto Rico	160	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rhode Island	180	209	252	231	275
South Carolina	180	194	245	215	270
South Dakota		199	254	224	271
Tennessee	180	170	211	195	229
Texas	180	188	201	214	254
Utah	180	196	325	225	275
Vermont	175	214	259	236	282
Virginia	180	186	229	213	251
Washington	180	205	253	243	288
West Virginia	180	206	249	225	270
Wisconsin	180	189	232	219	262
Wyoming	175	208	259	226	278

The various studies conducted on extending the school year have produced mixed results on the overall impact on student performance; however, three consistent findings have been realized:

1. *Quality of Time is more important than quantity of time*. Lengthening the school year is more than adding time. It must involve a comprehensive redesign of the educational program including additional professional development for staff.
2. *Low Income and Low ability student benefit most from extended school years*
3. *No relationship has been found between scores on international test of Academic Achievement and the Amount of time Students spend in school.* As shown in Table I, the top five performing countries on the PISA average 209 days of school per year, however, there are a number of countries which are in school over 210 days per year which are among the lowest performing nations.

There is clear research on the extended time that students need to close the achievement gap. Successful urban systems that have closed the achievement gap have offered not only quality teacher time during the day but extended quality learning time for students in the form of "double dosing", additional class time, before and after school opportunities to enhance and accelerate their learning. To address the issue of closing the achievement gap in persistently low

performing schools (PLA), Kati Haycock (2001) refers to Lesson 3: Student's Need Extra Help in research that has clearly illustrated that "almost all students can achieve at high levels if they are taught at high levels. But equally clear is that some students require more time and instruction…..we need to double or even triple the amount and quality of instruction that they get". *Massachusetts 2020* and its national affiliate, the National Center on Time & Learning, are resources for an enlarging group of states and districts that are exploring expanded learning time—several of which, including Oklahoma, Alabama, and Rhode Island, have launched new initiatives in 2010. In 2006, *Massachusetts 2020* worked with state leaders in Massachusetts to spearhead the Massachusetts Expanded Learning Time Initiative, the first-in-the-nation statewide initiative to expand the school day. In 2010-2011, 19 schools in 10 school districts had schedules which increased learning time by 300 hours across the school year. The 300 hours equates to an increase of approximately 40 days. The state of Massachusetts has long been a national leader in student achievement. Their most recent partnership with the state, community partnerships and school districts in Massachusetts to launch *Massachusetts 2020* keeps them at the forefront of the work all urban systems should embrace.

The EAA of Michigan understands what it takes to prepare students for a global, information based economy. The current 1,098 minimum seat time requirement in the State of Michigan is insufficient to meet the educational needs of students enrolled in the Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) schools; therefore the EAA of Michigan proposes to increase the school year by 40 days for students. As depicted in Tables III and IV, Michigan's proficiency standards for reading and mathematics in both grades, 4 and 8, when compared to NAEP achievement levels falls into the lowest performing categories. In the most recent NAEP, Michigan ranked 39th in performance in Language Arts and 47th in performance in mathematics when compared to other

states. If we were to disaggregate the data and use performance outcomes in the persistently lowest achieving schools as a subgroup, in all probability, they would fall even lower than 39th and 47th respectively.

Table III: States' proficiency standards for grade 4 reading and mathematics classified into NAEP achievement levels: 2009

		Reading			
		Below Basic	***Basic***	***Proficient***	***Total***
Mathematics	***Proficient***	–	MA	–	
		0	1	0	1
	Basic	AK, AR, AZ, CA, DC, DE, GA, HI, IA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MN, MT, NC, ND, NV, CH, OR, SC, SD, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI	CT, FL, ME, MO, MS, NH, NJ, NM, OK, PA, RI, VT, WV, WY	–	
		28	14	0	42
	Below Basic	AL, CO, IL, MD, **MI**, NY, TN	–	–	
		7	0	0	7
	Total	35	15	0	50

Table IV: States' proficiency standards for grade 8 reading and mathematics classified into NAEP achievement levels: 2009

		Reading			
		Below Basic	***Basic***	***Proficient***	***Total***
Mathematics	***Proficient***	– 0	MA 1	– 0	1
	Basic	AK, DE, HI, ID, KS, MD, UT, WI 8	AR, AZ, FL, IA, IN, KY, LA, ME, MN, MO, MS, MT, ND, NH, NJ, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, VT, WA, WV, WY 28	– 0	36
	Below Basic	AL, CO, GA, IL, MI, TN, TX, WA 8	CT, DC, NC, NY 4	– 0	12
	Total	16	33	0	49

Source: United States Department of Education, Institute of Educational Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading and Mathematics Assessment United States Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, EDFacts by 2008-09, Washington, DC, 2010. The National Longitudinal School-Level State Assessment Score Database (NLBL8480) 2010.

Plan of Action

The EAA of Michigan has studied the lessons learned and will use the research from the Massachusetts Expanded Learning Time Initiative (*Massachusetts 2020*) as well as the research cited earlier to execute the proposed instructional calendar. The new calendar is designed to implement a high quality year-round experience for students and moves Michigan away from failed, outdated and traditional approaches to teaching and learning.

Successful extended year initiatives exhibit the following twelve characteristics: (Chalkboard Project, 2008; Silva, 2007). A review of these characteristics shows tight alignment with the strategic vision of the EAA of Michigan and its theory of change.

1. Strong Leadership;
2. Committed and well-trained teachers;
3. A safe and supportive teaching and learning environment;
4. Use of evidence-based and data-driven practices;
5. Support for reform from parents, school partners, and the community;
6. A focus on core academic and enrichment activities that are aligned with other school goals and reforms;
7. Use of extra time to implement proven practices (e.g. time should be devoted to specific interventions backed by a strong evidence base, such as integrating technology into the classroom, giving students individualized attention, and providing instruction in longer blocks of time)
8. Involvement of entire community in the decision with early notification;
9. A strong staff development program is needed so the extra time is used appropriately;
10. Consideration of staff opinion prior to implementation due to potential for burn out;

11. Incorporation of evaluation and using the results to shape the reform (i.e. is time being used effectively, need for modifications, stakeholder perceptions, impact on student performance); and
12. Voluntary implementation and decided on a district by district or school by school basis. Studies have found that extended year programs are most successful when the experience is not perceived as punitive

The research of Glass (2002), Cooper (2001) and Lewin & Tsang (19978) all indicate that only large additions to the school calendar affect increases in student performance. They further noted that success depends greatly on local conditions including such aspects as planning and development, understanding the breakpoint at which the added days don't result in additional learning, and the use of pilot programs for gradual implementation of extended year initiatives to better understand successes and challenges. These research findings align with the EAA of Michigan's theory of action which is driven by the belief that strong leadership, execution of strategy, autonomy, flexibility and an uncompromising system of accountability within a student-centered system of education will enable local school leaders and teachers to collaboratively build an equitable, outcomes-driven, 21st Century teaching and learning environment where time is the variable, learning the constant, and students the focus.

Financially, it is important to note that research studies estimate that increasing the school year by 10% (e.g. 18 days) raises base costs by six to seven percent per student. (Van Beek, 2009, Chalkboard Project, 2008, Silva, 2007). The cost calculations are based largely on increased teacher salaries, additional operating costs (e.g. utilities), transportation, supplementary curricular materials and maintenance. The EAA expects a similar increase in base cost of six to seven percent. Despite the addition of a greater number of days, there is not a similar increase in teacher salaries due to building the cost of a longer year into the base salary schedule.

The EAA of Michigan engaged approximately 900 stakeholders including approximately 100 students from across the state of Michigan in strategic conversations about the transformation of Michigan's persistently lowest performing schools into 21st Century educational centers for improved teaching and learning. The outcome of these forums was the development of a Strategic Vision and Work Plan which ascribed non-negotiables to a different paradigm for radically transforming traditional public education; a robust student-centered learning platform, common assessments, global partnerships, individualized learning plans for all students, the use of technology as a teacher and learning tool, and the establishment of innovative education practice where time is the variable, learning the constant, and students the focus. The Strategic Vision and Work Plan call for these initiatives to take place via an extended day and extended year framework.

Proposed Teacher Salary Schedule

The proposed starting teacher salary is $50,000. Increments will not be based on high education degrees, steps or lanes. Increases will be based on student growth and achievement targets. The projected pay for performance system is under development and will be vetted with a collaborative teacher committee from the EAA of Michigan member schools. The first year of employment will be a baseline year and a cost of living increase will be awarded for year one and built into the salary schedule for each year forward. Upon approval of the pay for performance system it will be implemented in year two. The EAA of Michigan will also apply for a Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) competitive grant through the United States Department of Education. Table V reflects how the Education Achievement Authority will fund the proposed Extended Day/Extended Year Program.

Table V: Additional Cost Summary for Extended Year for the Educational Achievement Authority of Michigan 2012 -2013

Extended Year Additional Cost Summary *	
Extended year for the Education Achievement Authority of Michigan will increase expenditures in 3 categories - Salary, Transportation, and Utilities. The calculations for the increased costs are reflected below.	
Salary	
$ 5,000 + 30% Benefits ($ 1,500)	$ 6,500
Certified FTE's (Full time equivalent) whose salary is impacted by extended year 602 Teachers + 19 Assistant Principals equals 621 FTE's	
621 Certified FTE's x $ 6,500 **Total Salary Cost for Extended Year**	**$ 4,036,500**
Transportation	
70% of 11,142 Total Projected EAA Students are Transported equals 8,000 Students	
$ 8,160,000 Budgeted for Transportation from DPS divided by 8000 transported Students divided by 170 School Days equals $ 6 per day per Student	$ 6
Extra school days for Students equals 40 days (8000 Students x $ 6 per Student per day x 40 days) **Total Transportation Cost for Extended Year**	**1,920,000**
Utilities	
$ 4,159,901 Total DPS Utilities' Budget (current year) for the 15 EAA Schools	$ 4,159,901
Daily Rate ($ 4,159,901 divided by 365 days)	$ 11,397
Extra Days ($ 11,397 x 40 days) **Total Utilities Cost for Extended Year**	**$ 455,880**
Total Cost for Extended Year	**$ 6,412,380**
Revenue for Extended Year	
Extended Year for the EAA of Michigan will be budgeted through the State's per pupil allocation. These expenditures will be funded by reallocating reduced central administration expenditures to the local schools.	
* Revised Salary and Transportation Calculations.	
Salary: Removed FTE categories not affected by Extended Year. Transportation: Per student expense changed from $ 5 to $ 6.	

Budget Analysis For Extended Year

Certified		
Teachers (408 Teachers)	$	26,520,000
Principals	$	2,535,000
Assistant Principals HS	$	1,326,000
Assistant Principals Elem	$	773,500
JROTC Instructor	$	643,500
Nurse	$	877,500
Counselor Social Worker Parent Liaison	$	2,431,000
Media Specialist	$	1,072,500
Total	**$**	**36,179,000**

State Categorical (Certified)		
Teachers Categorical (75 Teachers)	$	4,875,000
State Categorical	**$**	**4,875,000**

Grand total Non-Federal	**$**	**68,021,926**

Classified		
Clerical- Secretaries	$	1,768,000
Clerical- Attendance Clerk	$	780,000
Clerical- Business Managers	$	819,000
Data Analyst	$	819,000
Media Aid	$	741,000
Total	**$**	**4,927,000**

Contracted Service		
Custodial/Maintenance	$	11,780,926
Security	$	1,600,000
Food Services	$	500,000
Transportation	$	8,160,000
Total	**$**	**22,040,926**

The categories above reflect budgeted amounts for certified personnel, classified personnel, and contracted services.
The total from all four groups equals the $ 68,021,926.

Central Administration Revenue (6%) State $ 5,209,100 + Federal $ 2,339,820	$	7,548,920
Schools Revenue (94%)	$	118,266,420
Total Revenue	**$**	**125,815,340**

The category for Central Administration is 6% of State and Federal Revenue.

State Total Foundation Allowance	$	79,233,800
State Categorical	$	17,069,980
Total State Revenue	$	96,303,780
Minus Debt Service	$	9,058,440
Minus Central Administration	$	5,209,100
Net State Revenue	**$**	**82,036,240**

Net State Revenue minus Debt minus Central Administration	$	82,036,240
Total Expense Non-Federal	$	68,021,926
Net Income after Expenditures	$	14,014,314
Minus Extended Year Additional Cost	$	6,412,380
Materials, Supplies, Curricular Expenditures	$	7,601,934
Balance		**$0**

Net State Revenue equaling $ 82,036,240 is calculated by taking Total State Revenue $ 96,303,780 minus Debt Service and Central Administration $ 14,267,540. After Extended Year Additional Cost, $ 7,601,934 in State Revenue remains for Materials, Supplies, and Curricular Expenditures.

Proposed Instructional Calendar for 2012-13 School Year

The Education Achievement Authority of Michigan provides the following three calendars for consideration (Options A, B, & C).

Education Achievement Authority of Michigan School Instructional Calendar 2012 - 2013 (Option A)

Holidays
PD or Teacher Workday
Start/End of Academic Year
Parent -Teacher Conferences
Testing Dates

JULY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

AUGUST

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

SEPTEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

OCTOBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

NOVEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19		21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

DECEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

JANUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

July 2012
9-27 Principals' Institute

August 2012
6-31- Staff Development

September 2012
19 Student Contact Days
3 Labor Day Holiday
4 Students' First Day

October 2012
22 Student Contact Days
9-12 -State Testing
15-17 -State Testing
19 - Parent-Teacher Conferences

November 2012
18 Student Contact Days
6 - Professional Development
21 - 23 Thanksgiving Holidays

December 2012
15 Student Contact Days
24- 31 - Winter Holidays

January 2013
21 Student Contact Days
1 - Winter Holidays
21-Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday

February 2013
17 Student Contact Days
18- Presidents' Day
19 Professional Development
20 Teacher Workday

March 2013
19 Student Contact Days
6-8- Testing Dates
28 Parent Teacher Conferences
29 Professional Development

April 2013
17 Student Contact Days
1-5 Spring Break

May 2013
22 Student Contact Days
27 Memorial Holiday

June 2013
20 Student Contact Days

July 2013
18 Student Contact Days
1-4 Independence Week

August 2013
2 Student Contact Days
5-6 Teacher Workdays

First Quarter	54 Days
Second Quarter	52 Days
Third Quarter	52 Days
Fourth Quarter	52 Days

FEBRUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28		

MARCH

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

APRIL

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

MAY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

JUNE

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

JULY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

AUGUST

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Education Achievement Authority of Michigan School Instructional Calendar 2012 - 2013 (Option B)

Holidays
PD or Teacher Workday
Start/End of Academic Year
Parent -Teacher Conferences
Testing Dates

JULY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

July 2012
9-27 Principals' Institute

AUGUST

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

August 2012
6-31- Staff Development

SEPTEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

September 2012
19 Student Contact Days
3 Labor Day Holiday
4 Students' First Day

OCTOBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

October 2012
22 Student Contact Days
9-12 -State Testing
15-17 -State Testing
19 - Parent-Teacher Conferences

NOVEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

November 2012
16 Student Contact Days
6 - Professional Development
19 - 23 Thanksgiving Holidays

DECEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

December 2012
15 Student Contact Days
24- 31 - Winter Holidays

JANUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

January 2013
21 Student Contact Days
1 - Winter Holidays
21-Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday

February 2013
17 Student Contact Days
18- Presidents' Day
19 Professional Development
20 Teacher Workday

March 2013
19 Student Contact Days
6-8- Testing Dates
28 Parent Teacher Conferences
29 Professional Development

April 2013
17 Student Contact Days
1-5 Spring Break

May 2013
22 Student Contact Days
27 Memorial Holiday

June 2013
20 Student Contact Days

July 2013
18 Student Contact Days
1-4 Independence Week

August 2013
4 Student Contact Days
7-8 Teacher Workdays

First Quarter 52 Days
Second Quarter 54 Days
Third Quarter 52 Days
First Quarter 52 Days

FEBRUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28		

MARCH

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

APRIL

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

MAY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

JUNE

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

JULY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

AUGUST

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Education Achievement Authority of Michigan School Instructional Calendar 2012 - 2013 (Option C)

Holidays
PD or Teacher Workday
Start/End of Academic Year
Parent -Teacher Conferences
Testing Dates

JULY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

July 2012
9-27 Principals' Institute

AUGUST

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

August 2012
6-31- Staff Development

SEPTEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

September 2012
18 Student Contact Days
3 Labor Day Holiday
4 Students' First Day

OCTOBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

October 2012
22 Student Contact Days
9-12 -State Testing
15-17 -State Testing
19 - Parent-Teacher Conferences

NOVEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19		21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

November 2012
18 Student Contact Days
6 - Professional Development
21 - 23 Thanksgiving Holidays

DECEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

December 2012
15 Student Contact Days
24- 31 - Winter Holidays

JANUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

January 2013
20 Student Contact Days
1 - Winter Holidays
21-Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

February 2013
17 Student Contact Days
18- Presidents' Day
19 Professional Development
20 Teacher Workday

March 2013
19 Student Contact Days
6-8- Testing Dates
28 Parent Teacher Conferences
29 Professional Development

April 2013
17 Student Contact Days
1-5 Spring Break

May 2013
22 Student Contact Days
27 Memorial Holiday

June 2013
20 Student Contact Days

July 2013
18 Student Contact Days
1-4 Independence Week

August 2013
4 Student Contact Days
7-8 Teacher Workdays

First Quarter 53 Days
Second Quarter - 53 Days
Third Quarter 52 Days
Fourth Quarter - 52 Days

FEBRUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28		

MARCH

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

APRIL

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

MAY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

JUNE

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

JULY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

AUGUST

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

References

Aronson. J., Zimmerman, J., & Carlos, L. (1999). Improving Student Achievement by Extending School: Is It Just a matter of Time? WestEd, San Francisco, CA. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED435127.

Associated Press/ (2009). More School: Obama Would Curtail Summer Vacation. September 28, 2009. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org.

Chalkboard Project (2008). A Review of Research on Extended Learning Time in K-12 Schools. Retrieved from http;//www.chalkboardproject.org/images/PDF/Extended learning final rev.pdf.

Cooper H. (2001). The Effects of Summer Vacation on Achievement Test Scores. Presentation on the Middle school Extended-Year Proposal sponsored by the California Education Policy Seminar and the California State University Institute for Education Reform, February 2001. Retrieved from http://www.calstate.edu/IER/reports/extended middle.pdf.

Cotton, K. (1989). Educational Time Factors. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory Archives, School Improvement Research Series. Retrieved from http://www.nwrel.org/archive/sirs/4/cu8.html.

Glass, G.V. (2002). School Reform Proposals: The Research Evidence. Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ. Retrieved from http://epsl.asu.edu/epru/documents/EPRU 2002-101/chapter 04-Glass-Final.htm.

Haycock, K., (March, 2001) "Closing the Achievement Gap" *Educational Leadership*. 58(6) p. 6-11.

Levin, H.M., & Tsang, M.C. (1987). The Economics of Student Time. Economics of Education Review, 6(4), 357-364.

Massachusetts 2020. Massachusetts Expanded Learning Time Initiative. Retrieved from http://www.mass2020.org/node/10.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Retrieved from httP://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2011). Programme for International Student Assessment 2009.

Silva, E. (2007). On the Clock: Rethinking the Way Schools Us Time. Education Sector Reports. Retrieved from http://www.educationsector.org/usr_doc/OntheClock.pdf.

Tomlinson, J., (2004). Number of Instructional Days/Hours in the School Year. Education Commission of the States. Retrieved from www.ecs.org.

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2005, 2007, and 2009 Mathematics Assessments. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning Evaluation and Policy Development, EDFacts SY 2008-09, Washington, DC, 2010.